

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1 and 8 are amended herein, and claims 9-23 are added. No claims have been canceled. As a result, claims 1-23 are pending for examination, with claims 1, 9 and 16 being independent.

Specification Objections

In paragraph 2, the Office Action objects to the specification for failing to include an Abstract of the Disclosure. The Applicant provides an Abstract of the Disclosure with this amendment, and respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,705,852 to Orihara et al. ("Orihara") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,723,907 to Akram ("Akram"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As amended, claim 1 recites an electronic circuit including a planar base having first and second base surfaces, an antenna attached on the first surface of the base, and a chip connected to the antenna, characterized in that a double faced adhesive is glued on one of the base surfaces, the double faced adhesive having an opening and the chip being arranged at least partially in the opening.

The Office Action contends that Orihara discloses the limitations of claim 1, with the exception of the chip being arranged at least partially in a slot made in the double faced adhesive. The Office Action also contends that Akram teaches a "semiconductor die" which is attached to a slot by a double faced adhesive, and that it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Akram to the disclosure of Orihara to better protect the chip from the outside environment, and to allow shortening the length of connecting wires, as taught by Akram. The Applicant respectfully disagrees, as claim 1 distinguishes over any combination of the cited references.

Akram teaches that a die is affixed within a slot in a base surface using an adhesive. Akram states that the adhesive contacts the die and the slot along the active surface and periphery of the die (col. 5, lines 10-15). As shown in Figures 2, 4 and 6, the adhesive of Akram

completely fills the gap between the die and the base surface. Akram does not teach an opening in the adhesive, or that the chip is arranged in the opening. Thus, Akram does not disclose or suggest a chip arranged at least partially in an opening in a double faced adhesive, as recited in claim 1. As a result, the combination of Orihara and Akram fails to disclose the limitations of claim 1, and claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the combination. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 2-8 and 23 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

New Claims

Claims 9-23 are presented to further define the Applicant's contribution to the art.

Claim 9 recites an electronic circuit, comprising a base having first and second surfaces; an antenna supported by the first surface of the base; a double faced adhesive adhered to the first surface of the base and having a thickness in a direction extending away from the first surface, the double-faced adhesive having an opening, wherein at least a portion of the antenna is disposed in the opening; and an electronic chip disposed at least partially in the opening and electrically coupled to the antenna, the electronic chip having a height in a direction extending away from the first surface; wherein the thickness of the double faced adhesive is greater than or equal to the height of the electronic chip.

As discussed above with reference to claim 1, the asserted combination of Orihara and Akram does not disclose or suggest an electronic circuit having a chip disposed in an opening in a double faced adhesive. Furthermore, as shown in Figures 2, 4 and 6, the chip of Akram is thicker than the adhesive which attaches the chip to the base. Thus, the asserted combination does not disclose or suggest an electronic circuit comprising a double faced adhesive having a thickness greater than or equal to the height of a chip, as recited in claim 9. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the limitations of claim 9 are not met by the prior art of record.

Claims 10-15 depend from claim 9 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 16 recites an electronic circuit, comprising a base having first and second surfaces; an antenna supported by the first surface of the base; a double faced adhesive adhered to the first surface of the base, the double faced adhesive having an opening, wherein at least a portion of the antenna is disposed in the opening; and an electronic chip disposed at least partially in the

opening and electrically coupled to the antenna; wherein the electronic chip is spaced from and does not contact the double faced adhesive.

As discussed above with reference to claim 1, the asserted combination of Orihara and Akram does not disclose or suggest an electronic circuit having a chip disposed in an opening in a double faced adhesive. Furthermore, in Akram, the adhesive secures the chip to the base. Thus, the asserted combination does not disclose an electronic circuit having a chip disposed in an opening in a double faced adhesive, wherein the chip is spaced from and does not contact the double faced adhesive, as recited in claim 16. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 16 patentably distinguishes over the prior art of record.

Claims 17-22 depend from claim 16 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,
Guillaume ROYER, Applicant

By: *Richard F. Giunta*
Richard F. Giunta, Reg. No. 36,149
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211
Telephone: (617) 720-3500

Docket No. S01022.80246.US
Date: August 7, 2003
x08/07/03x